

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

**Claim Rejection-35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over **Tsuboi et al.** (USP 6,236,380, previously cited) in view of **Teradaira** (USP 6,516,440). For the reasons set forth in detail below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, it is noted that the statement of rejection on page 2 of the Office Action indicates that the claims are rejected under §102. However, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner combines **Teradaira** with **Tsuboi et al.** and provides reasons why it would have been obvious to combine the references. See Office Action, page 3, lines 12-22. Thus, it is apparent that the rejection is under §103.

The Office Action applies the **Tsuboi et al.** reference in substantially the same manner as in the previous rejection, but now recognizes that **Tsuboi et al.** does not disclose “a save command which causes a plurality of measurement electronic device units to simultaneously save measured values by the respective detectors in the memories.” See Office Action, page 3, lines 12-14. Applicants agree with the Examiner regarding this deficiency of **Tsuboi et al.** The Examiner applies **Teradaira** to teach the features not disclosed by **Tsuboi et al.**

The **Teradaira** reference discloses a printer control method for controlling the saving of information regarding printer operating conditions to a non-volatile memory of the printer. The

printer 1 includes various sensors for monitoring operating conditions. Printer status data, which is generated in response to operating conditions detected by the sensors, is temporarily stored in a volatile memory (RAM 3) during operation of the printer (see col. 5, lines 34-37 and col. 7, lines 7-10). The printer status data stored in RAM 3 is sequentially updated, and is later copied and saved to specific storage areas in a non-volatile memory (EEPROM 5) in response to specific trigger events (see col. 7, lines 10-13).

**Teradaira** teaches that data stored in the RAM 3 and EEPROM 5 is segmented into six different storage areas. Further, the printer status data is divided into six groups, each of which is assigned to a respective one of the storage areas (see col. 7, line 58-col. 8, line 2 and Fig. 4). Each data group is linked to one or more trigger events which trigger the saving of that data group from the RAM 3 to the EEPROM 5. *As a result, data updating is accomplished in groups, saving one or a plurality of data groups at a time* (see col. 8, lines 1-5).

Examples of the groups stored in the different storage areas are described in col. 8, lines 44-63. Examples of the trigger events are described in col. 8, lines 32-43.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify “said parent device has a means for issuing a one-time measured value save command...to thereby cause said plural measurement electronic device units to simultaneously ~~save-measured~~ store in the respective memories the values measured by the respective detectors ~~in the memories~~ at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command.”

As discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the **Teradaira** reference does not alleviate any of the deficiencies of **Tsuboi et al.**, and therefore the combination of references does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

The Office Action does not provide a detailed discussion of how the **Teradaira** reference is being interpreted. However, it appears that the Examiner considers the various sensors for monitoring operating conditions of the printer to be types of measurement electronic device units. Further, it appears that the Examiner considers the trigger event in **Teradaira** that triggers the saving of a data group to correspond to the one-time measured value save command that simultaneously saves measured values.

However, **Teradaira** teaches simultaneously saving measured values (i.e., a data group) that are currently stored in volatile memory (RAM 3) into a non-volatile memory (EEPROM 5) in response to a trigger event. Unlike the claimed invention, **Teradaira** does not disclose or suggest a parent device “issuing a one-time measured value save command to ...plural measurement electronic device units including the own unit...*to thereby cause said plural measurement electronic device units to simultaneously store in the respective memories the values measured by the respective detectors at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command,*” as presently recited in claim 1.

More specifically, **Teradaira** teaches that the printer status data generated by the sensors and stored in RAM 3 is *sequentially* updated (see col. 7, lines 8-11). Therefore, the printer status data generated by the sensors is not simultaneously saved in memory (RAM 3). Further, the saving of data groups related to printer status data in the EEPROM 5 in response to a trigger

event is not the same as the claimed “[causing] *said plural measurement electronic device units to simultaneously store in the respective memories the values measured by the respective detectors at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command.*” In particular, the saving of data groups from the RAM 3 to the EEPROM 5 is simply transferring data from one memory to another and is not “[causing] ...plural measurement electronic device units to simultaneously store in the respective memories the values measured by the respective detectors at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command.”

More specifically, according to present claim 1, the values that are simultaneously stored are the values measured at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command. In contrast, according to **Teradaira**, the data groups that are apparently simultaneously transferred from RAM 3 to EEPROM 5 in response to a trigger are not “values measured by the respective detectors at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command.” Further, as noted above, the values measured by the respective sensors of **Teradaira** are sequentially saved, and not simultaneously saved.

Furthermore, it is noted that in the previous Amendment (i.e., Submission of Amendment under §1.114 filed on October 19, 2007), it was argued that the **Tsuboi** reference does not disclose or suggest “*said parent device has a means for issuing one time measured value save command to said plural measurement electronic device units including the own unit, in response to a request from the external device, ...*”.

More specifically, the Examiner considers the “transmission-identifying END signal” of **Tsuboi** to correspond to the “measured value save command.” In summary, the Examiner’s

position, as articulated in the ***Response to Arguments*** of the April 25, 2007 final Office Action, appears to be that the “transmission identifying END signal,” which informs of the completion of automatic address setting, corresponds to the claimed “*measured value save command*” because, after the automatic address setting is completed, “measurement data can be collected and stored.” The Examiner cites col. 13, lines 53-57; col. 14, lines 13-19 and lines 20-26, although address setting is also described in detail in col. 10, line 55 – col. 11, line 28 of **Tsuboi**.

The transmission-identifying END signal informing completion of address setting is apparently sent to the computer 60 from all relaying units 20M, 20S, 40S prior to performing measurement (see col. 12, lines 24-29). However, it is respectfully submitted that the transmission-identifying END signal is not sent from a parent device (i.e., the master unit 20M) to plural measurement electronic device units in response to a request from an external device (i.e., the computer 60). Thus, **Tsuboi** does not teach the claimed “*said parent device has a means for issuing a one time measured value save command to said plural measurement electronic device units including the own unit, in response to a request from the external device, ...*”. **Teradaira** does not alleviate this deficiency of **Tsuboi**.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, and claims 2-20 which depend therefrom, patentably distinguish over the cited prior art and define allowable subject matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under §103 are respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/532,810  
Art Unit: 2857

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
Attorney Docket No.: 052503

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



William M. Schertler  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 35,348  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/dlt